

Serial No. 10/506,318
August 18, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated May 18, 2005
Page 9 of 11

REMARKS

Claims 9-18, 20-32, and 34-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 9, 13, 16, 23, 27, and 30 and cancel claims 19 and 33.

Applicants' counsel greatly appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the interview of August 17, 2005.

Claims 9-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the limitations of the wire saw and the coolant must be provided in separate method steps to be considered part of the claimed method.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is well established that an Examiner is required to give patentable weight to features recited in a wherein clause to the extent that the wherein clause limits the method steps. Griffin v. Bertina, 285 F.3d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 2002). There is no justification for requiring every feature in a method claim to be recited within a method step. In fact, the Federal Circuit has held that no limitation or wording anywhere in the claim can be ignored in determining patentability. In re Stencel, 828 F.2d 751 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Nevertheless, Applicant has adopted the Examiner's suggestions in order to expedite allowance of the application.

Claims 9 and 23 have been amended to recite steps of "providing a wire saw"

Serial No. 10/506,318
August 18, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated May 18, 2005
Page 10 of 11

and "providing a coolant" per the Examiner's suggestions. Claims 13 and 27 have been amended to recite the steps of "providing a plurality of rollers" and "passing the wire between the sloped surfaces of the guide groove" per the Examiner's suggestions. Furthermore, claims 16 and 30 have been amended to recite "feeding the wire saw with a tension."

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection. Claims 10-18, 20-22, 24-32, and 34-36 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 9 and 23 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 9 and 23 are allowable.

The Examiner also advised Applicant in the Office Action that should claims 18 and 32 be found allowable, claims 19 and 33 would be objected to as being a substantial duplicate thereof. Accordingly, claims 19 and 33 have been canceled.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are respectfully solicited.

Serial No. 10/506,318
August 18, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated May 18, 2005
Page 11 of 11

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080